



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,302	10/08/2003	Atsushi Iwata	2635-183	5485

23117 7590 08/07/2006

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

BAREFORD, KATHERINE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1762

DATE MAILED: 08/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

✓

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/680,302

Applicant(s)

IWATA, ATSUSHI

Examiner

Katherine A. Bareford

Art Unit

1762

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 5-7.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the amendment to claim 5 would raise new issues, because the amendment to have the last three lines read "... for forming a protective layer for a subsequent gas sensor electrode to ^{be} from said subsequent protective layer to a desired thickness" would mean that "said subsequent protective layer" lacks antecedent basis as the term "a subsequent protective layer" earlier has been replaced with "a protective layer"..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: (1) as to the argument that the finality was premature, the Examiner disagrees. As discussed in paragraph 8 of the Final Rejection, the references were added to the rejection directly because of the new wording of the claims. While the claims may previously have been rejected under 35 USC 112, the specific changes made by applicant were decided by applicant and they changed the specific requirements of the claims, and this had to be responded to in the next Office Action by the Examiner. (2) as to the 35 USC 112 rejection, the proposed amendment has not been entered, and as applicant's arguments are directed to the claims as proposed to be amended, the Final Rejection stands for the reasons given in the Final Rejection. (3) As to the arguments against the 35 USC 103 rejection, applicant argues features of '214, '562, Frieze and Yamada and that one would not be motivated to modify, for example '214 in view of '562. The Examiner has reviewed these arguments, however, the rejection is maintained. The primary reference is to "the admitted state of the prior art" as discussed in the Final Rejection, and thus, the modification is done based on this primary reference. Applicant has provided no discussion of the teachings of the admitted state of the prior art or why it would not be suggested to modify its teachings base on the other cited references. As discussed at pages 7-9 of the Final Rejection, it is the Examiner's position that one would modify the admitted state of the prior art based on the teachings of the cited art.


KATHERINE BAREFORD
PRIMARY EXAMINER